

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

TOWN OF CHINCOTEAGUE

September 3, 2008 – 6:00 pm – Council Chambers – Town Hall

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

AGENDA ADOPTION

1. August 2008 report
2. Status of requests from August meeting
 - a. Main Street crosswalks
 - b. Drainage at old school
 - c. Drainage at School/Sharpley
 - d. List of roads that need patching
 - e. Parking at School/Sharpley intersection
 - f. Chipper
 - g. Bicycle safety at solid waste center
 - h. Outside mechanic services
 - i. Excess road material at harbor
 - j. Schedule for downtown restroom septic installation
 - k. Sixteen foot dump truck with lift gate
 - l. Scrap metal
 - m. Prioritize roads projects
 - n. Drainage at S. Main Street store
 - o. Drainage at Bunting and Main
 - p. Waterworks Technician job description
3. Public Works plan reviews
4. Request to modify Branscome contract
5. Discussion of Public Works priorities
6. Committee member comments

Public Works Projects August 2008

Public Works Administration

- Several staff members were required to attend an appeal hearing for a workers compensation claim.
- Reviewed building permit for a property on Mason Drive
- Reviewed proposed drainage work at a property in Ocean Breeze.
- Reviewed Public Works plan review procedures.
- Completed two major repairs to pickup trucks.
- Continued interim measures to cover for the open Roads and Facilities Supervisor. Ronnie Lewis agreed to temporarily help us in this position and started work in this capacity on August 13th.

Roads

- Continued replacement of Church Street sidewalks. Completed significant demolition work. Contractor installed 5 driveway entrances and approximately 800 feet of sidewalk.
- Replaced motor on tar wagon. Began work on evaluating and repairing potholes and utility cuts.
- Finished work on drain pipe for ditch at elementary school.
- Extended drainage ditch near Maddox Boulevard traffic circle.
- Made minor and major repairs to street sweeper. Worked on a schedule for street sweeping services.
- Replaced 18 signs in July and 27 in August. This included street name and regulatory signs.
- Worked on clearing vegetation around signs, right of way areas and sight distance problems.

Facilities

- Performed general cleanup at Town parking lot.
- Public Works staff spent a significant amount of time cleaning up the shop and yard areas.

Waterworks

- Matt Butler attended the Virginia Tech waterworks short course.
- Mike Cosby, AJ Bowden and J. Jeffries attended a waterworks conference. One of the presentations was by Andy Landrum of Whitman Requardt regarding our water main replacement project.
- Continued interim pump duty measures to cover for staff shortages.
- Repaired a major leak on Pine Drive.

- Utility Service Corp. returned and completed the remaining punch list items for the ground water storage tank roof replacement project.
- Re-wrote the Waterworks Technician job description.

Mosquito Control

- Aerial sprays were conducted on August 2, August 6 and August 26.
- Conducted hazard assessment for Mosquito Control chemicals.



TOWN OF CHINCOTEAGUE, INC.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Works Committee
FROM: Michael Cosby, Public Works Director
DATE: September 1, 2008
SUBJECT: Public Works plan reviews

I suggest that we conduct a review of our existing policies, code, ordinances and job descriptions in regards to our Public Works plan review process. I believe that there are many major improvements we can make in this area. Following are some points that may merit consideration:

Director of Public Works job description: makes no mention of functions concerning private facilities or property. Plan reviews are specifically limited to "construction of public facilities". I think this could be construed to include water mains and meters on private property or entrances to public roads but little else. There is also no reference in the job description of the designation of the Director of Public Works as the highway and roads engineer by Section 2.01 of the Land and Subdivision Development Ordinance. These would appear to be significant omissions.

Land Subdivision and Development Ordinance, Section 13.01: the definition of subdivision does not include any division of three or fewer parcels unless a new street or road is involved. There is no role for the Public Works Director indicated for properties that fall under this category.

Land Subdivision and Development Ordinance, Sections 14.02, 14.03 and 15.02: The Public Works Director does not participate in the conference prior to the preparation of plans for major and minor subdivisions. This would be a good time to communicate with developers about requirements that are relevant and where information can be found. After the complete submission of the preliminary plat, the Public Works Director is required to review the submission and forward comments to the zoning administrator within 21 days. Actually this is a double requirement because section 14.03 (d) 1 refers to the highway engineer and 14.03 (d) 2 refers to utilities like our water system. My first

question is whether the Health Department or other utilities comply with the 21 day requirement and if not what are the consequences? The second question is whether we truly want both the roads and water situation reviewed within 21 days. Just how much of a priority is this when considered in context with the many other operations, projects and emergencies handled by the Public Works Director? What if the subdivision is unusually large or complex? What if a developer submits plans significantly in advance of his intention to build – does this trump more immediate priorities? What happens if their submission is incorrect or incomplete – does the 21 days start all over when it is corrected?

Land Subdivision and Development Ordinance Sections 14.06: The procedures for approval of the final plat do not specify a deadline date for plan review. Is this also 21 days?

Chincoteague Code Chapter 22 Article III Sections 22-62 (10) a. and 22-62 (10) b.: Drainage requirements from the Nuisances code section require Public Works Director to make a determination regarding effects to public and private drain ways prior to the performance of any drain work. Also requires a permit from the Public Works Director for many types of drainage work on private property. These requirements need to be more specific if we want them enforced usefully. There are many variations of work and situations that could be included in this category and the vague review and permit process is not reasonably manageable.

Chincoteague Code Chapter 62 Article II Division 3 Sections 62-86, 62-87, 62-88: deals with water service connections and water main extensions in a fair amount of detail. The responsibility for reviewing these situations presumably lies with the Public Works Director although that is not specifically stated. There are some time requirements mandated for the design, payment for and installation of water main extensions but no other review process deadlines are described. There are also some plan review issues associated with the connection and availability fees in Section 62-57 that should be discussed.

Building permits: Our building permit application says to allow a minimum of 5 working days for application to be processed and 30 days if Health Department approval is necessary. Again, the question here is where does this review fall within the context of the other demands on the time of the Public Works Director? Do we want this done in 5 days no matter what else is going on? Sometimes the questions raised by the building permit are complex and require additional research – does it still have to be done in 5 days?

Commercial entrances: the only requirement provided on this topic is on the building permit application, where it says that the roads engineer must be contacted “prior to the issuance of your building permit application” Surely that is a typographical error and was probably meant to say “prior to the issuance of your building permit” or “prior to your submission of your building permit application”. I can find no other Town guidance regarding commercial or residential entrances to state highways. The VDOT manual

“Minimum Standards of Entrances to State Highways” states that permits are required prior to work on or crossing of any right of way, as well as changes of use or increases in traffic volume. The VDOT manual does not impose a specific time deadline on the issuance of these permits, saying in 24 VAC 30-71-20 that “the applicant shall submit plan(s) and application(s) ... in sufficient time to permit ... the review and make any necessary studies and changes”. Appeals are permitted by 24 VAC 30-71-30 if applications are not “processed in a timely fashion”. The manual also points out that VDOT resident engineers are authorized to issue private entrance permits and that some other permits and waivers must be approved through higher authorities. Since we are responsible for our own roads and do not employ an engineer, I strongly recommend that we enact some sort of legislation requiring appropriate engineering reports on at least some of our complex or unusual entrance permit applications. I also found another reference to the permit process in the VDOT “Land Development Manual” that I can review if we want to proceed with improvements in this area.

Overall, I think we should consider the following improvements:

- 1- Review our current policies and practices to develop more consistency and to make sure they are serving their intended function. The above suggestions should be a step in the right direction.
- 2- Evaluate all of these processes in terms of how they should be handled in comparison to other important priorities and the allocation of staff time. Arbitrary deadlines do not make sense if the person reviewing plans has other vital responsibilities.
- 3- Develop procedures that give permit applicants and developers realistic expectations of the timeframes involved in their requests. Providing a list of requirements upfront for minor reviews or requiring an initial meeting to discuss more detailed plans would be helpful, and an appeal process might also be appropriate. For instance, if someone thought the plan review was taking too long, a third party could assess the situation and make a decision. This might help the situation where people believe that if they are yelling the loudest they will get what they want sooner. This is not conducive to a quality plan review.
- 4- Develop better standards for submissions from permit applicants and developers. Many problems could be avoided if people would bring in correct plans. The role of the reviewer should be to review completed plans and not to provide engineering services.
- 5- Provide some regular, uninterrupted time for the reviewer to consider plans, research requirements, answer questions from applicants and provide written responses to deficient plans. It is next to impossible to devote the proper attention to the plan review process when the phone rings every five minutes or when you have to answer questions from applicants in the post office. Being instantly available to all comers is also not conducive to quality plan reviews.



TOWN OF CHINCOTEAGUE, INC.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Ritter, Town Manager

FROM: Michael Cosby, Public Works Director *Michael Cosby*

DATE: August 23, 2008

SUBJECT: Contract adjustment request

I received the attached letter regarding our paving contract from Branscome this week. This two year contract will expire in November of this year and does not contain provisions for any price adjustments. They are asking for an increase of 31.5% in our contracted price. The asphalt price index that they reference in their letter shows an increase of 225% from March 2008 to August 2008.

We do, however, need to finish the surface paving on Church Street. For the purpose of comparison, the surface paving on Taylor Street last year required 550 tons for approximately 2,400 linear feet. The work area on Church Street is approximately 2,600 linear feet. If we accept this price increase, the additional cost would be roughly \$14,000.

We should also consider our relations with the contractor. Competition for this type work is limited and it is my understanding that there were significant problems the last time anyone other than Branscome did paving work for us. We should also be aware that the current contract expires soon and that we should expect significant increases, especially if we decide to enter into another two year contract. Other options include a one year contract or simply bidding each project separately. With the enormous fluctuations in oil and materials prices over the last several years it would be unreasonable to expect that we could forecast these costs accurately.

Based on our contract, I believe we can refuse this request if we so desire.

August 20, 2008

www.branscome.com

Mike Cosby
Director of Public Works
Town of Chincoteague
6150 Community Drive
Chincoteague, VA 23336

RE: Town of Chincoteague
1-PM-07
Town of Chincoteague 2007/08 Overlay Schedule
Asphalt Price Escalation

P.O. BOX 316
TASLEV, VIRGINIA 23441

PHONE: 757-787-4801

FAX: 757-787-8149

Dear Mr. Cosby:

Branscome Eastern Shore values our relationship with the Town of Chincoteague and we have made every effort to do quality work and accomplish the street paving to meet your scheduling needs and on budget.

Unfortunately, due to unprecedented instability in the liquid asphalt market completely beyond our control, we are forced to request an increase in the price of hot mix asphalt under this contract. The Virginia State Asphalt Liquid Price Index for March 2008 was \$365.00 per ton. The posted index price for August 2008 is \$826.50 per ton.

We are therefore requesting a contract modification for the price of surface hot mix asphalt from \$74.50 per ton to \$98.00 per ton.

We await your reply at your earliest convenience. Please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,



Douglas S. Matthews Jr.
Operations Manager